

Appln. No. 10/700,953
Amendment dated October 26, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed March 17, 2005

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 3, 5 through 8, 10 and 12 through 16 remain in this application. Claims 4, 9 and 11 have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn or added.

Paragraphs 1 through 13 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 7, 9, and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Authier.

Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Authier in view of Slutsky.

Claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Authier in view of Moscarillo.

Claim 1, particularly as amended, requires "each of said light emitting members being elongated with a longitudinal axis between opposite ends", "each of said holder members comprising a pair of spaced walls, a bore extending through each of said spaced walls and removably receiving a portion of said light emitting member", and "each of said holder members comprising a mounting portion for selectively securing the associated one of said holder members to the vehicle, said mounting portion of each of said holder members extending between said spaced walls of said associated holder member, said mounting portion having a substantially planar surface for positioning against the vehicle, said substantially planar surface being oriented substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis of said light emitting member removably received in the bores of said spaced walls". These features of the claimed invention are submitted to facilitate the use of the invention with a vehicle, especially a boat, which has broad vertical sides.

Appln. No. 10/700,953

Amendment dated October 26, 2005

Reply to Office Action mailed March 17, 2005

It is therefore submitted that the cited patents, and especially the allegedly obvious combination of Authier, Slutsky, and Moscarillo set forth in the rejection of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claim 1. Further, the claims that depend from claim 1 also inherit the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §102(b) and 103(a) rejection of claims 1 through 3, 5 through 7, 10, and 12 through 13 is therefore respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.

Date: Oct 26, 2005

Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
Customer No. 40,158
P.O. Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357